**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**
**APPELLATE SIDE.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1518 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ... Petitioners.
V/s.
Shri Ramakant P. Rede ... Respondent.

Shri D.A. Patil, AGP for the petitioner.

Shri Ameya Tamhane i/b Seema Sarnaik for the respondent.

**CORAM : V.C.DAGA, J.**
**DATED : 17.4.2006.**

**P.C. :**
**----**

. This petition is directed against the order dated 10.8.2004 passed by the Industrial Court, Solapur, in Revision (ULP) No. 51/2003 whereby order passed by the Labour Court, Solapur, dated 27.9.2003, in Complaint (ULP) No. 27/2002 has been confirmed.

2. Shri Patil, learned AGP appearing for the petitioner submitted that the order of the Industrial Court is a sketchy order and submissions of the petitioner have not been considered in the impugnesd order. He further submits that the finding recorded by the Labour Court that the respondent-workman has worked for 240 days during the preceding period of 12 months is also erroneous.

3. It is true that the order of the Industrial Court is a sketchy order. It was expected on the

part of the Industrial Court to deal with all rival contentions with reasons. However, sketchy order by itself, on every occasion cannot be a ground to set aside the impugned order. The order of confirmation need not be a detailed order. The Labour Court has dealt with all the rival contentions based on the material available on record. Since the order of the Industrial Court is only a confirming order, the same can be sustained on the basis of the findings recorded by the Labour Court. The Labour Court has recorded a specific finding that the chart submitted by the workman showing number of days for which he had worked during the the year 2001 has been admitted by petitioner. Admission is a good evidence.

4. In view of clear-cut admission that the workman has worked for 365 days during the year 2001 i.e. from 1.3.2001 to 28.2.2002, the submission made by the learned AGP has no strength. When learned AGP was confronted with this admission, he had no option but to admit that the chart was admitted by the petitioner and if that be so, petitioner has no case to stand. Certified copy of the chart is retained on record. Considering the material on record, petition is devoid of any substance. It is thus, dismissed in limine with no order as to costs.

**(V.C.DAGA,J.)**